

# A Factor-Adjusted Multiple Testing Procedure with Application to Mutual Fund Selection

Wei Lan and Lilun Du

*Southwestern University of Finance and Economics and University of  
Wisconsin-Madison*

## Abstract

In this article, we propose a Factor-Adjusted multiple Testing (FAT) procedure based on factor-adjusted  $p$ -values in a linear factor model involving some observable and unobservable factors, for the purpose of selecting skilled funds in empirical finance (Barras et al., 2010; Cuthbertson et al., 2008). The factor-adjusted  $p$ -values were obtained after extracting the unknown latent factors by the method of principal component (Wang, 2012). Under some mild conditions, the false discovery proportion (FDP) can be consistently estimated even if the idiosyncratic errors are allowed to be weakly correlated across units. Furthermore, by appropriately setting a sequence of threshold values approaching zero, the proposed FAT procedure enjoys model selection consistency. Both extensive simulation studies and a real data analysis on how to select skilled funds in US financial market are presented to illustrate the practical utility of the proposed method.

**Key Words:** Factor Model; False Discovery Proportion; Fund Performance; High Dimensional Data; Multiple Testing

**Short Title:** Factor-Adjusted Multiple Testing

---

<sup>†</sup>Wei Lan is from Statistics School and Center of Statistical Research, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics. Lilun Du is from the Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, WI 53706. The corresponding author: Lilun Du (dulilun@stat.wisc.edu).

# 1. INTRODUCTION

Due to the rapid development of FoF (fund of fund), how to search outperforming funds among a large pool of candidates has attracted much attention from both investors and academic researchers (Barras et al., 2010; Cuthbertson et al., 2008; Fama and French, 2010). Although several existing literatures claimed that the active investment should be a negative sum game after costs and document negative average fund alphas, recent papers indicated that some of the funds indeed display stock picking ability (Barras et al., 2010), which makes locating the funds with significant stock picking ability is not always a wild goose chase. In the mutual fund literature, it is common that the funds with significant stock picking ability should outperform others. For that reason, investors usually sort the funds according to some particular fund performance measure such as the Sharpe ratio or Jensen's  $\alpha$  according to their past returns, and invest more in funds that recently performed well with the expectation that these funds will continue to do so in the future.

Whether the funds with the highest past performance continue to produce higher returns in the future has received much attention in the literature (Grinblatt and Titman, 1992; Carhart, 1997). To date, there are still no clear evidences that the funds performance can be persistent. As noted by Fama and French (2010), fund performance persistency tests all have a critical limitation. That is, these tests are all based on ranking funds according to their short term past performance. As a consequence, the allocation of funds into winner funds and loser funds may be largely due to noise or error, which questions the usefulness of the existing performance persistency tests. To take into account the possible noise, one possible solution is to assess the relative impact of luck (noise) and skill (signal) in determining each fund's performance (Cornell, 2009). Consequently, how to identify the funds in which their performance are largely due to skill other than luck is a topic of practical demand.

Intuitively, the funds returns are quite hard to reproduce in the future if they are largely produced due to noise and luck. To this end, it is natural to wonder how many

fund managers possess true stock picking ability (Barras et al., 2010; Fama and French, 2010). According to the definition of Barras et al. (2010), a fund can be regarded as a skilled fund if it has positive risk adjusted return net of costs, i.e., the funds that have managers with stock picking ability sufficient to cover the trading cost and expenses. Of course, we cannot observe the true risk adjusted return of every fund in the population. Therefore, to identify skilled funds, a simple  $t$ -test can be applied to each fund to assess whether it has positive risk adjusted return. From a statistical point of view, this amounts to conducting the following simultaneous hypotheses testing problems,

$$H_{0i} : \mu_i = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1i} : \mu_i \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where  $\mu_i$  is the intercept of fund  $i$  specified in the following model

$$Y_{it} = \mu_i + \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_t + \varepsilon_{it},$$

which is usually very sparse (only a very small number of  $\mu_i$ s are nonzero) according to Berk and Green equilibrium (Berk and Green, 2004). Here,  $Y_{it}$  is the excess return of fund  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_t$  are the systematic risk factors related to some specific linear pricing model, such as the capital asset pricing model (CAPM) of Sharpe (1964), and the three-factor model of Fama and French (1993); more rigorous definitions of the notations will be presented later. To identify sparse positive  $\mu_i$  among a large scale of simultaneous hypotheses testing problems, Barras et al. (2010) suggested to control for the false discovery rate (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995; Storey et al., 2004) instead of familywise type I error and discussed its usefulness for mutual fund selection. It is worth mentioning that the legality of such procedure is largely depending on one critical assumption, that is, the test statistics for testing each  $H_{0i} : \mu_i = 0$  are weakly correlated, otherwise, the false discovery rate is failed to be controlled at the nominal level (Fan et al., 2012; Storey et al., 2004). The weak dependence assumption of the test statistics for testing  $H_{0i} : \mu_i = 0$  is equivalent to assuming that almost all of the variation of the mutual fund returns can be captured by the

aforementioned linear asset pricing model (Sharpe, 1964; Fama and French, 1993), so that  $\varepsilon_{it}$ s are weakly correlated across different funds. However, it is remarkable that whether the aforementioned linear asset pricing models are enough to explain funds return is a highly controversial topic in empirical finance over the last twenty years (e.g., Kleibergen and Zhan (2013); Jin et al. (2014)), which questions the usefulness of the procedure proposed by Barras et al. (2010) and some adjustments are inevitable.

To make possible adjustment, one first needs to understand under what circumstances the random noise  $\varepsilon_{it}$  are strongly correlated. Let  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  be the covariance matrix of  $\mathcal{E}_t = (\varepsilon_{1t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{Nt})^\top$ . According to the definition of Chamberlain and Rothschild (1983), when the observed systematic risk factors can fully explain the funds returns asymptotically, we can assume  $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}) < \infty$  with  $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}})$  being the largest eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}$ . By contrast, if the linear pricing model failed to explain the funds returns sufficiently, we can expect that  $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}) \rightarrow \infty$ . This is a structure that can be easily explained if the random noise  $\varepsilon_{it}$  admits an approximate factor structure (Chamberlain and Rothschild, 1983; Pesaran, 2006; Jin et al., 2014). In this case, there exist some unobservable systematic risks that are still not captured by commonly used linear pricing model, so that the funds excess returns follow a multi-factor error structure involving some observable and unobservable factors. Under such a multi-factor error structure model, the existing multiple testing procedures of Storey et al. (2004) and Barras et al. (2010) are no longer applicable (Leek and Storey, 2008; Fan et al., 2012; Friguet et al., 2009). To fix the problem, some appropriate factor adjusted procedures are needed for the multiple testing.

Motivated by the practical demand, we are intending to alleviate the method of Barras et al. (2010) via a Factor-Adjusted multiple Testing (FAT) procedure. Statistically, our interest is to simultaneously testing whether the intercept of each unit is equal to zero in a linear factor model setting involving some observable and unobservable factors, while the idiosyncratic errors are weakly correlated. Under this framework, we first construct factor-adjusted  $p$ -value for each test based on factor-adjusted test

statistic obtained by the method of principal component (Wang, 2012) for extracting the latent common factors. The factor-adjusted  $p$ -values are then utilized to implement the multiple testing procedure of Storey et al. (2004) and Barras et al. (2010). Accordingly, we refer to this adjustment as Factor-Adjusted multiple Testing (FAT) procedure. We show theoretically that under some mild conditions, the FAT procedure can consistently estimate the FDP. Furthermore, by appropriately setting a sequence of threshold values approaching zero, the proposed FAT procedure can achieve consistent model selection under some sparsity and regularity conditions. All of the theoretical results are further confirmed by extensive numerical studies.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. The model, notations and technical conditions are introduced in Section 2. Theoretical justification of FDR estimate and the property of model selection consistency are discussed in Section 3. Extensive numerical experiments and a real data analysis are presented in Section 4 and Section 5, respectively. Section 6 concludes the article with a short discussion. All the technical details are relegated to the Appendix. Throughout the entire article, we denote by  $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \{tr(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})\}^{1/2}$  the Frobenius norm of any arbitrary matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ .

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. Notations and Assumptions

We assume there are a total of  $N$  units, and each unit has  $T$  observations. Let  $Y_{it} \in \mathbb{R}^1$  be the response variable of unit  $i$  at time  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_{1t}, \dots, X_{pt})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$  be the observed explanatory variables. Throughout the entire article, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we assume  $N \gg T$  and  $T$  tends to infinity for asymptotic behavior, while  $p$  is fixed. We next consider the following multivariate linear regression,

$$Y_{it} = \mu_i + \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i = (\beta_{i1}, \dots, \beta_{ip})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$  are unknown regression

coefficients,  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is the corresponding random error, and  $\mu_i$  is the intercept. Define  $\mathbb{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{iT})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^T$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{1t}, \dots, Y_{Nt})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and let  $\mathbb{Y} = (\mathbb{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbb{Y}_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$  be the response matrix. Moreover, let  $\mathbb{X} = (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_T)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times p}$  be the design matrix, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$  collects all the intercepts for each unit. In addition, we assume that the random error  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_t = (\varepsilon_{1t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{Nt})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is independent and normally distributed with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}$ , and collect the error matrix as  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}} = (\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_T) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that all the response and explanatory variables have been appropriately standardized and centralized such that  $\text{var}(Y_{it}) = 1$  and  $E(X_{jt}) = 0$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq p, 1 \leq t \leq T$ . To further model the dependence structure of  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}$ , we assume that  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_t$  admits the following latent factor structure (Pesaran, 2006; Fan et al., 2008, 2011),

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}_t = \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{Z}_t + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{.t}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}_t = (Z_{1t}, \dots, Z_{rt})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^r$  is the low dimension of  $r$  unknown common factors with identification restriction  $\text{cov}(\mathbf{Z}_t) = \mathbf{I}_r$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times r}$  is the unknown factor loadings, and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{.t} = (\eta_{1t}, \dots, \eta_{Nt})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is the random noise that is independent of  $\mathbf{Z}_t$  and  $\mathbf{X}_t$ . For simplicity, we assume there is no interaction effects between the explanatory variables  $\mathbf{X}_t$  and the latent factors  $\mathbf{Z}_t$ . To further model the test-specific variations, we assume that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{.t}$  is normally distributed and weakly dependent such that, for some positive constant  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{.t} &\sim \mathbb{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) \quad \text{with } \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\sigma_{i_1 i_2}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}), \\ N^{-2+\delta} \sum_{i_1 \neq i_2} |\rho_{i_1 i_2}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}| &= O(1), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\mathbb{N}$  stands for multivariate normal distribution, and  $\rho_{i_1 i_2}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \sigma_{i_1 i_2}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} / (\sigma_{i_1 i_1}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \sigma_{i_2 i_2}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}$  is the correlation coefficient between  $\eta_{i_1 t}$  and  $\eta_{i_2 t}$ . We remark here that Fan et al. (2012) also introduced a similar condition as in (2.3) (replacing the pairwise correlation by its covariance component) for weakly dependent normal random variables, to explore

the extent to which their approximated FDP can be consistently estimated. These two definitions are essentially equivalent when the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$  are bounded away from zero and infinity.

Under the multi-factor error structure of (2.2), the model (2.1) can be further written as

$$Y_{it} = \mu_i + \boldsymbol{\beta}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_t + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^\top \mathbf{Z}_t + \eta_{it}, \quad (2.4)$$

and the main focus of current article is to simultaneously testing the following hypotheses

$$H_{0i} : \mu_i = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1i} : \mu_i \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (2.5)$$

under the model setup (2.4) based on the observations  $\mathbb{Y}$  and  $\mathbb{X}$ , which will be addressed in the next subsection.

## 2.2. Factor-Adjusted Multiple Test Procedure

We first consider the testing problems (2.5) by ignoring the dependence structure of  $\mathcal{E}_t$ . Employing traditional ordinary least squares (OLS) estimation method based on the observed data  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t, \mathbf{X}_t\}_{t=1}^T$ , we can obtain the estimated intercept  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\top = (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbb{Y}^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}_T - \mathbb{X}(\mathbb{X}^\top \mathbb{X})^{-1} \mathbb{X}^\top$  and  $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^T$  is a vector of 1s of dimension  $T$ . To smooth theoretical derivations, we summarize the distribution property of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  as follows:

$$(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \sim^d \mathbb{N}((\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}).$$

Then, the unadjusted test statistic for the  $i$ -th hypothesis is defined as  $\hat{T}_i^u = \hat{\mu}_i / s.e.(\hat{\mu}_i)$  with  $s.e.(\hat{\mu}_i) = (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\mathcal{E}})^{1/2}$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\mathcal{E}}$  is the  $i$ -th diagonal element of  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{E}} = T^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\top$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbb{Y}^\top$ . Similar to  $\mathbf{Q}$ , define  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{I}_T - \tilde{\mathbb{X}}(\tilde{\mathbb{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbb{X}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbb{X}}^\top$  with  $\tilde{\mathbb{X}} = (\mathbf{1}, \mathbb{X})$ . By normal approximation, the unadjusted  $p$ -values are formulated as  $P_i^u = 2\Phi(-|\hat{T}_i^u|)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Before moving on to design a multiple testing procedure, it is important to investigate to what extent of dependence, some classical multiple testing

procedures can still be applied to the unadjusted  $p$ -values directly. To date, it has theoretically been shown that BH method and its variants (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995; Storey et al., 2004) continue to be valid under some special dependence structures such as positive regression dependence on subset (Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2001) or weak dependence assumption. More theoretical insight on the effect of dependence on multiple testing was provided in Clarke and Hall (2009). Other than that, some recent developments in multiple testing fields have shown that utilizing the dependence structure can improve the efficiency. For instance, Genovese et al. (2006) incorporated the prior information related to each hypothesis into BH procedure through  $p$ -values weighting, and further showed that the power is improved while the false discovery rate is controlled at the nominal level; Sun and Cai (2009) developed a multiple testing procedure based on compound decision theoretical framework for exploiting the dependence structure to improve testing efficiency. Unfortunately, all these procedures are no longer applicable to our case due to the strong dependence among  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}$ . Recently, Fan et al. (2012) developed a treatment called Principle Factor Approximation (PFA) to cure the problem associated with arbitrary covariance dependence. Although their approach is accurate in terms of consistently estimating the FDP based on a sequence of unadjusted  $p$ -values, the rank of the rejected hypotheses remains unchanged, thus is still inefficient even if they exploit the dependence structure of  $\mathcal{E}$ . In this article, we seek to design a new testing procedure to improve the efficiency under the multi-factor error structure in (2.4). Towards this end, we propose an alternative  $p$ -value based on factor-adjusted test statistics, which significantly changes the signal-to-noise ratio for testing the intercepts in (2.5) and thus the structure of the  $p$ -values. More importantly, since the latent factor has been removed from the factor-adjusted  $p$ -values, the weak dependence assumption among the factor-adjusted  $p$ -values are expected to be satisfied, hence the multiple testing procedure in Storey et al. (2004) can be implemented in the downstream analysis. We will elaborate this idea in details as follows.

According to (2.2), we can obtain

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}^\top = (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top + (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top, \quad (2.6)$$

where  $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_T)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times r}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\cdot T}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$ . We note that  $(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top$  follows a multivariate normal distribution, that is,

$$(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}^\top \sim^d \mathbb{N}(0, \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}). \quad (2.7)$$

The weak dependence assumption (2.3) tells us that after removing the latent factor  $\mathbf{Z}$  from  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ , the resulting test statistics would behavior analogously to independence. As a result, we define an oracle factor-adjusted test statistics as

$$\tilde{T}_i = \frac{(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \hat{\mu}_i - (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i}{(\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2}} = \frac{(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \mu_i + (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i \cdot}}{(\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2}}. \quad (2.8)$$

From (2.7) and (2.8),  $(\tilde{T}_1, \dots, \tilde{T}_N)$  follows multivariate normal distribution with mean  $(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} D(\boldsymbol{\eta})^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\mu}$  and covariance matrix scaled from  $D(\boldsymbol{\eta})^{-1/2} \Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} D(\boldsymbol{\eta})^{-1/2}$ , with  $D(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \text{diag}\{\sigma_{11}^\eta, \dots, \sigma_{NN}^\eta\}$ . In practice, the oracle factor-adjusted  $p$ -values are intractable. The plug-in method would naturally lead to a factor-adjusted test statistic defined as

$$\hat{T}_i = \frac{(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \hat{\mu}_i - (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i}{(\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2}}, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i$  are some estimators of idiosyncratic error variance, unobservable factors and factor loadings, respectively. The details about  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i$  will be discussed later. Intuitively, the null distribution of  $\hat{T}_i$  can be approximated by a standard normal distribution, from which the factor-adjusted  $p$ -value for the  $i$ -th hypothesis of (2.5) is then defined as  $P_i = 2\Phi(-|\hat{T}_i|)$ .

Before we turn to describe our factor-adjusted multiple testing procedure, we first introduce some commonly used notations. Denote by  $\mathcal{N}_0, \mathcal{N}_1$  the set of indices cor-

responding to the true null and non-null in (2.5), respectively. Let  $N_0$  and  $N_1$  be the cardinality of  $\mathcal{N}_0$  and  $\mathcal{N}_1$  and define by  $\pi_0 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N_0/N$  the asymptotic proportion of the true null. Similar to Storey et al. (2004), we define the following empirical processes:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) &= \#\{i \in \mathcal{N}_0 : P_i \leq t\}, \\ S(t) &= \#\{i \in \mathcal{N}_1 : P_i \leq t\}, \quad \text{and} \\ R(t) &= \#\{P_i : P_i \leq t\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Then  $V(t)$ ,  $S(t)$  and  $R(t)$  are the number of falsely rejected hypotheses, the number of correctly rejected hypotheses, and the total number of rejected hypotheses, respectively. The false discovery proportion with respect to the threshold  $t$  is defined as  $\text{FDP}(t) = V(t)/\{R(t) \vee 1\}$  with  $R(t) \vee 1 = \max\{R(t), 1\}$ . The false discovery rate is defined as the expectation of FDP, i.e.,  $\text{FDR}(t) = E\{\text{FDP}(t)\}$ . It is worth mentioning that  $V(t)$  is unobserved but realized through an experiment, while  $R(t)$  can be observed.

As expected,  $\widehat{T}_i$  will resemble  $\widetilde{T}_i$  in large extent as long as the latent factors and factor loadings can be estimated with certain accuracy. Based on this rationale, we adopt the procedure of Storey et al. (2004) for testing (2.5), which is less conservative than the method of Benjamini and Hochberg (1995) and was shown to be valid under a very general weak dependence structure. Specifically, for a pre-chosen level  $\alpha$  and a tuning parameter  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ , a data-driven threshold for the  $p$ -values is determined by

$$t_\alpha(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda) = \sup \{0 \leq t \leq 1 : \widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t) \leq \alpha\}, \tag{2.11}$$

where  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$  is a point estimate of  $\text{FDR}(t)$ , which is given by

$$\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t) = \frac{N\widehat{\pi}_0(\lambda)t}{R(t) \vee 1} = \frac{\widehat{\pi}_0(\lambda)t}{\{R(t) \vee 1\}/N}, \tag{2.12}$$

where  $\widehat{\pi}_0(\lambda) = \{(1 - \lambda)N\}^{-1}\{N - R(\lambda)\}$  is an estimate of  $\pi_0$ . We then reject the null hypothesis if its  $p$ -value is less than or equal to  $t_\alpha(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)$ . Hereafter we will refer to (2.12) as the *estimation approach* for FDR and (2.11) as the *controlling approach* for FDR. We term (2.11) and (2.12) as the Factor-Adjusted multiple Testing procedure (FAT) hereafter.

### 2.3. Connection and Differences with Existing Methods

The idea of adjusting the effect of dependence by a factor model under multiple testing framework is not new; it has been tentatively studied by Leek and Storey (2008), Friguet et al. (2009) and Fan et al. (2012). Compared with existing literatures, the proposed FAT procedure is distinguished from them in the following two aspects.

#### (1.) Relation to Leek and Storey (2008) and Friguet et al. (2009)

The main focus of Leek and Storey (2008) and Friguet et al. (2009) is simultaneously testing the significance of the regression coefficients  $\beta_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , while our focus is simultaneously testing the significance of the intercepts motivated from mutual fund selection in empirical finance. By definition in Leek and Storey (2008), the linear space spanned by latent random vectors capturing the dependence among the tests was termed as *dependence kernel*, which has found two specifically scientific applications, i.e., spatial dependence typically assumed in brain-imaging data and latent structure due to relevant factors not being included in biological studies. In contrast, our latent factor structure  $\mathbf{Z}$  has implications on unobserved systematic risks, shedding new light on empirical finance. More importantly, the unique feature for testing high dimensional intercepts alleviates the *confounding* phenomenon between the observed and unobserved systematic risks, whereas the existing procedures for testing regression coefficients associated with observed explanatory variables were prone to generate spurious signals due to interactions between observed and unobserved common factors. In addition, Leek and Storey (2008) and Friguet et al. (2009) employed some variants

of EM-type algorithms to estimate the number of latent factors, the factor loadings, as well as the latent factors. Such a method is demonstrated to be quite useful in simultaneous point estimation. Nevertheless, the resulting estimators do not have explicit solutions, which poses more challenges when investigating the effect of estimation errors for the subsequent testing procedure. As an alternative, we propose to estimate the factor number, the latent factors and factor loadings through the method of principal component (Wang, 2012); see Section 3.1 for details. We will show theoretically that such a simple procedure can consistently estimate the FDP even when the idiosyncratic errors are allowed to be weakly correlated. Consequently, our procedure has formal theoretical justifications under much weaker conditions, compared with the methods of Leek and Storey (2008) and Friguet et al. (2009).

*(2.) Relation to Fan et al. (2012) and Fan and Han (2013)*

To take into account possible correlation between test statistics, Fan et al. (2012) and Fan and Han (2013) proposed a FDR estimation procedure by assuming that the test statistics follow a latent factor structure. Unlike this article, as well as Leek and Storey (2008) and Friguet et al. (2009), which directly assume a factor structure on the raw data, Fan et al. (2012) imposed a factor structure on the test statistics as an alternative. Such an assumption is demonstrated to be very appealing for the purpose of estimating false discovery proportion (FDP). Nevertheless, the meaning of the latent factors that captured by test statistics is quite hard to be interpreted. By contrast, in our model, the latent factors can be regarded as some unobserved systematic risks in financial market and thus have apparent economic meanings. Moreover, the methods of Fan et al. (2012) and Fan and Han (2013) rely on the assumption that the test statistics are normally distributed, which may be too restrictive in practice when the number of observations are limited. Lastly, it is worth mentioning that Fan et al. (2012) designed a simple method to select the number of latent factors. However, as illustrated by our simulation studies in Section 4, the selection of the number of latent factors are volatile with the choice of threshold values and the strength of signals. To fix this

issue, we employ an eigenvalue ratio criterion in the spirit of Wang (2012) to select the latent factors, and show theoretically that the resulting criterion can select the factor number consistently when the unknown intercepts are quite sparse. For comparison, we also present the methods of Fan et al. (2012) and Fan and Han (2013) in simulation studies; see Section 4 for details.

### 3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this section, we first theoretically justify that the factor-adjusted  $p$ -values under the true null satisfy similar weak dependence assumption as in Storey et al. (2004), under which the asymptotic properties of the *estimation approach* for FDR in (2.12) can be established in sparse setting with  $\pi_0 = 1$  for any given threshold  $t$ . Subsequently, when  $t \rightarrow 0$ , we turn to derive a sequence of threshold values  $t_T \rightarrow 0$  such that  $V(t_T) \rightarrow 0$  and  $S(t_T)/N_1 \rightarrow 1$ . Accordingly, the FAT procedure enjoys the consistent model selection (Wang and Leng, 2007).

#### 3.1. Weak Dependence of the Factor-Adjusted $p$ -Values Under the True Null

As discussed in Storey et al. (2004), the weak dependence assumption of  $p$ -values plays an essential role in controlling for the false discovery rate. To verify that our factor-adjusted  $p$ -values share similar properties, we propose a two-stage approach to justify the weak dependence of the null factor-adjusted  $p$ -values. In the first stage, we approximate  $V(t)$  by summations of a series of standard normal distribution functions within which some general estimators of unknown factors and factor loadings are involved, followed by discussing how to estimate the unknown factors and factor loadings. This type of approximation is similar to the approximate expression of FDP derived in Fan et al. (2012). In the second stage, the convergence rates of the estimators of unknown factors and factor loadings are obtained, by which we further approximate  $V(t)/N_0$  by some distribution function without involving any unknown parameters. Combining these two stages, the weak dependence assumption of the null

factor-adjusted  $p$ -values can be justified (from Stage I) and the approximated distribution function can be directly utilized in the downstream multiple testing (from Stage II).

*Stage I: Approximation of  $V(t)/N_0$*

To assess the asymptotic property of  $V(t)$ , we evaluate it based on the oracle factor-adjusted test statistic  $\tilde{T}_i$  and the given estimators  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\hat{\gamma}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} I(P_i \leq t) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} I(|\hat{T}_i| > -z_{t/2}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \left\{ I(\hat{T}_i > -z_{t/2}) + I(\hat{T}_i < z_{t/2}) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \left[ I \left\{ \tilde{T}_i > -z_{t/2} (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} + (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} (\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\gamma}_i - \mathbf{Z} \gamma_i) / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + I \left\{ \tilde{T}_i < z_{t/2} (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} + (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} (\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\gamma}_i - \mathbf{Z} \gamma_i) / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} \right\} \right], \quad (3.1) \end{aligned}$$

where  $z_{t/2} = \Phi^{-1}(t/2)$  is the  $t/2$  lower quantile of a standard normal distribution. Borrowing the normality properties from  $\{\tilde{T}_i, i = 1, \dots, m\}$  and the weak dependence among them,  $V(t)$  can be further approximated by the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** *Under the assumption (2.3), for general given estimators  $\hat{\gamma}_i$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$  that are independent of  $\eta_i$ , we can obtain that, with probability tending to one,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left[ N_0^{-1} V(t) - N_0^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \left\{ \Phi(z_{t/2} (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} + (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} (\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\gamma}_i - \mathbf{Z} \gamma_i) / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2}) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \Phi(z_{t/2} (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} - (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q} (\hat{\mathbf{Z}} \hat{\gamma}_i - \mathbf{Z} \gamma_i) / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2}) \right\} \right] = 0. \quad (3.2) \end{aligned}$$

It is worth mentioning that the above proposition involves some estimators of unknown parameters that need to be specified. To this end, we consider the following estimation procedure.

We estimate  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\gamma$  using the method of principal component (Wang, 2012). Specifically, we firstly extract the effect of observed explanatory variables  $\mathbb{X}$  by regressing  $\mathbb{Y}_i$  on  $\mathbb{X}$ , and obtain the residual as  $\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\top = \mathbf{Q} \mathbb{Y}^\top = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1} \mu^\top + \mathbf{Q} \mathcal{E}^\top$ . We next

define  $\hat{\lambda}_j$  be the  $j$ -th largest eigenvalue of  $(TN)^{-1}\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\top\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ , while  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varrho}}_j$  be the corresponding eigenvector. Consequently, we set  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} = T^{1/2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varrho}}_1, \dots, \hat{\boldsymbol{\varrho}}_{\hat{r}})$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top$  can be estimated by  $(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\top$ . Based on the estimators  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ , we can obtain the estimated random error as  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}^\top = \mathbf{Q}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}})\hat{\mathcal{E}}^\top$  with  $\mathbf{Q}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}) = \mathbf{I}_T - \hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top$ . Subsequently,  $\sigma_{ii}^\eta$  can be estimated by  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta = T^{-1}\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{i\cdot}^\top\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{i\cdot}$ . Moreover, we define notations  $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ ,  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varrho}}_j$ ,  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$  as the associated estimators based on extract error  $\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top$ , while  $\bar{\lambda}_j$ ,  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\varrho}}_j$ ,  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$  are the estimators based on true error  $\mathcal{E}^\top$ . Practically, in the spirit of Wang (2012) and Ahn and Horenstein (2013),  $\hat{r}$  can be selected by maximizing the eigenvalue ratios as  $\hat{r} = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \leq \pi_{\max}} \hat{\lambda}_j / \hat{\lambda}_{j+1}$  with some pre-specified maximum possible order  $\pi_{\max}$ . The difference is that some unknown sparse intercepts  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  are involved in our estimation procedure, which poses more challenges for investigating the consistency of  $\hat{r}$  by carefully taking into account the effect of the intercepts.

**Remark 1:** Note that the initial estimator of intercepts  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  defined in (2.6) is obtained by extracting the effect of  $\mathbb{X}$ . As a result, to further control the effect of latent common factors, we only need to focus on the error after extracting the effect of observed explanatory variables  $\mathbb{X}$ , and not necessarily to control for the intercepts  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ . In fact, if the errors are obtained by controlling for both the effects of  $\mathbb{X}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , that is, the error is defined as  $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathbf{Y}^\top = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\mathcal{E}^\top$ , the resulting FAT procedure can lead to incorrect FDR control. The reason can be simply summarized as follows. The procedure of controlling for both the effects of  $\mathbb{X}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  involves estimating the intercepts  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  through OLS. When  $N$  is much larger than  $T$ , the resulting estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is inconsistent, and this type of inconsistency can not be adjusted through projection matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  according to (2.6). Since we ignored the information of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  for estimating the latent factors and factor loadings, the resulting principal component algorithm discussed above can be only valid when the signals of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  are quite weak, i.e., the intercepts are extremely sparse; see also condition (C2) in the next subsection.

**Remark 2:** In general, the independence between  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$  does not necessarily imply that the estimated versions, such as  $\hat{\mathbf{Z}}$ ,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta$  in the above algorithm, are inde-

pendent of the idiosyncratic error  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ . However, as  $N$  and  $T$  are sufficiently large, the estimated ones will appreciably resemble the true ones, resulting in asymptotic independence. Moreover, this type of asymptotic independence does not hurt the numerical performance for estimating FDP; see the numerical results in Section 4 for details. In fact, similar issues occurred in the literatures; see Proposition 2 in Leek and Storey (2008) and Proposition 1 in Allen and Tibshirani (2012). As a remedy, one can randomly split samples into two parts with equal size, where one part is exclusively occupied to estimate the latent factor and factor loadings, and the other part is used to implement our FAT procedure. To keep presentation succinct, we implicitly assume the *independence* assumption as in Proposition 1 throughout the remaining article.

*Stage II: Technical Conditions and the Weak Dependence of the Null  $p$ -values*

Proposition 1 provides asymptotic expressions of  $V(t)$  by summations of a series of normal distribution functions which involve some unknown parameters  $\sigma_{ii}^\eta, \mathbf{Z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ . If the convergence rates of  $\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta/\sigma_{ii}^\eta$  and  $\|\mathbf{Q}\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\|$  are fast enough, the summations of the series of normal distribution functions obtained in Proposition 1 will convergence to some *fixed* distribution function. Thus, the weak dependence assumption of the factor-adjusted  $p$ -values under the true null can be satisfied according to the definition of Storey et al. (2004). Before going further, we present the following conditions:

(C1)  $\log N \leq C_h T^{\bar{h}}$  for some positive constants  $\bar{h} < 1/2$  and  $C_h > 0$ .

(C2) For any finite positive constant  $C_\mu$ ,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\| \leq C_\mu \min \left\{ N^{1/2}/T^{1/2}, N/(TN_1^{1/2}) \right\}.$$

(C3)  $\min_i \sigma_{ii}^\eta \geq \sigma_0^2 > 0$  for some positive constant  $\sigma_0^2$ .

(C4) There exists some positive definite matrix  $\Sigma_\gamma$  of dimension  $r$  such that  $N^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rightarrow \Sigma_\gamma$ , with the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_\gamma$  being bounded from zero to infinity. Moreover, there exists some positive constant  $\gamma_{\max}$  such that  $\max_i \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\|^2 \leq \gamma_{\max}$ .

(C5)  $\max_{i \leq r} \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_i - \boldsymbol{\psi}_i\| = O_p(N^{-\nu})$  for some positive constant  $\nu > 0$ , where  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_i$  are the  $i$ -th eigenvectors of  $T^{-1}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}^\top$  and  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}$ , respectively.

(C6) Assume that  $R(t)/N \geq H$  for some  $H > 0$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

By condition (C1), the number of units  $N$  could diverge exponentially with the sample size  $T$ , so that  $N$  can be much larger than  $T$ . Condition (C2) can be satisfied if  $N_1$  is finite, which is reasonable for mutual fund selection (Barras et al., 2010). Condition (C3) can be satisfied if the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$  are bounded from 0. Similar conditions are commonly assumed in the literature; see, for example, Wang (2009). Condition (C4) is also widely used in the literature, which can be satisfied if the factor loadings are stationary in the sense that the signals of the latent factors are comparable and not weak (Ahn and Horenstein, 2013). Lastly, condition (C5) is directly borrowed from Fan and Han (2013), and can be valid for various strictures of  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{E}}$  and large  $N$ ; for more detailed discussion about this condition, we refer to Fan and Han (2013). Under the above conditions, we demonstrate the following result.

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose the assumption (2.3) and (C1)–(C5) hold. Under the sparse setting, we have*

$$(i.) \quad \mathbb{P}(\hat{r} = r) \rightarrow 1. \quad (3.3)$$

*If we further assume  $\tilde{\lambda}_{i-1} - \tilde{\lambda}_i \geq d_N$  for some positive constant  $d_N$  for any  $i = 2, \dots, r$ , then we have*

$$(ii.) \quad \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} \{V(t)/N_0 - t\} = 0. \quad a.s. \quad (3.4)$$

The proof is provided in Appendix B. According to the theoretical results of Proposition 2 (i.),  $\hat{r}$  can be equal to  $r$  with probability approaching 1. Hence, we assume that the number of true latent factors  $r$  is known to simplify the technical derivations hereafter. The result of Proposition 2 (ii.) indicates that the factor-adjusted  $p$ -values under the true null satisfies the weak dependence assumption of Storey et al. (2004), which is quite essential for deriving the consistency of the estimated FDP.

### 3.2. FDP property and Model Selection Consistency

In this subsection, we will discuss the asymptotic property of our FDP estimator when the intercepts are quite sparse that  $\pi_0 = 1$ . Under this setup, the consistency of  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$  can be readily obtained based on Proposition 2 (ii.) and condition (C6). Our theoretical result below is similar to that derived in Fan et al. (2012).

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose the assumption (2.3) and (C1)–(C6) hold. Then, for any  $t > 0$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t) - \text{FDP}(t)| &= O_p(N^{-\delta/2}) + O_p(\sqrt{\log N}/T^{1/2}) + O_p(N^{-\nu}) + O_p(N_1/N) \\ &\quad + O_p\left(N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2\right) + O_p\left(N_1^{1/2}N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Theorem 1 unveils that the *estimation approach* for FDR in (2.12) is consistent under sparsity assumption for any  $t > 0$ . Unlike non-sparsity case, for any fixed threshold  $t > 0$ ,  $\text{FDP}(t) = V(t)/\{R(t) \vee 1\} \rightarrow 1$  when  $\pi_0 = 1$ . This phenomenon is not surprising since the  $p$ -values under the alternative is negligible compared with that under the true null. From this point of view, the FAT procedure is expected to lose FDR control by simply fixing  $t$  or  $\alpha$  under sparse setting. This further motivates us to investigate the behavior of  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$  by letting  $t \rightarrow 0$ . It is worth mentioning that when  $t \rightarrow 0$ , the nominal level  $\alpha$  should be vanishing as well, which makes it quite hard to be specified in real practice. To make the procedure practically useful, our arguments for selection consistency below start from a sequence of threshold values for the factor-adjusted  $p$ -values. Specifically, for any given threshold value  $t_T$ , let  $\widehat{\mathcal{N}}_1^{t_T} = \{i; P_i \leq t_T\}$  be an estimate of  $\mathcal{N}_1$ . Assume that  $t_T \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . The selection consistency properties of  $\widehat{\mathcal{N}}_1^{t_T}$  can be summarized in the theorem below.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose the assumption (2.3) and (C1)–(C5) hold. If  $\pi_0 = 1$  and  $\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |\mu_i| \geq c_1 T^{-\kappa}$ , for some constants  $c_1 > 0$  and  $\kappa + \hbar/2 < 1/2$ , then for any  $\lambda \in [0, 1)$ , there exists a sequence of threshold values  $t_T \rightarrow 0$  such that  $P(\widehat{\mathcal{N}}_1^{t_T} = \mathcal{N}_1) \rightarrow 1$ .*

The proof is given in Appendix C. According to the proof of Theorem 2, to achieve consistent model selection, one can select the threshold values  $t_T = 1 - 2\Phi(c_2 T^j)$  for some  $\hbar/2 < j < 1/2 - \kappa$  and some positive constant  $c_2$ . Consequently, the proposed FAT not only provides consistent model selection under some minimum signal assumptions, but also able to control the FDR for any pre-specified nominal level  $\alpha > 0$ . This finding is quite important especially in finite samples; see, for example, Wasserman and Roeder (2009) for detailed discussions.

## 4. SIMULATION STUDIES

To gauge the finite sample performance of the proposed method, we conducted several simulation studies in this section. We especially focus on the following two aspects, namely, FDP and FDR properties of the FAT procedure in finite samples.

### 4.1. Simulation models and competing methods

Similar to Fan et al. (2008, 2011), we simulated the model (2.1) in the spirit of a standard Fama-French three-factor model (Fama and French, 1993), that is,

$$Y_{it} = \mu_i + X_{t1}\beta_{i1} + X_{t2}\beta_{i2} + X_{t3}\beta_{i3} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where a proportion  $\pi_0$  of the intercepts  $\{\mu_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$  are set to be zero, while the remaining ones are equal to some finite constant  $\mu$ . The observed three factors and their corresponding factor loadings are sampled from a standard normal distribution. Motivated by the empirical results of mutual fund selection as shown in Section 5, we simulated the random error  $\varepsilon_{it}$  from a latent factor model with only one common factor, that is,

$$\varepsilon_{it} = \gamma_i Z_t + \eta_{it},$$

where  $Z_t$  and  $\gamma_i$  were independently drawn from a standard normal distribution, and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\cdot t} = (\eta_{1t}, \dots, \eta_{Nt})^\top$  is independently sampled from a multivariate normal distribution

with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\sigma_{ij}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})_{N \times N}$  with  $\sigma_{ij}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = \rho^{|i-j|}$ . One can easily verify that the covariance matrix  $\Sigma_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$  satisfies the weak dependence assumption of (2.3). Throughout this section,  $\rho$  and  $\lambda$  are simply set to be 0.5 and 0.1, respectively; while the results for other settings are similar. All the simulation results are based on 500 replications.

To illustrate the superiority of the proposed FAT procedure, three existing procedures are compared:

Unadjusted procedure: the method without adjusting for any latent common factors (Barras et al., 2010). In other words, the unadjusted multiple testing procedure is defined as applying the method of Storey et al. (2004) to the unadjusted  $p$ -values, i.e.,  $\{P_i^u, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ .

POET-PFA: according to the Principle Factor Approximation (PFA) in Fan et al. (2012) and Fan and Han (2013), the FDP for the unadjusted  $p$ -values with respect to a threshold  $t$  can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{FDP}}^u(t) = & \min \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ \Phi \left( \frac{(\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\mathcal{E}})^{1/2} z_{t/2} + (\mathbf{1}^{\top} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{Q} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i}{(\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}} \right) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \Phi \left( \frac{(\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\mathcal{E}})^{1/2} z_{t/2} - (\mathbf{1}^{\top} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{1})^{-1/2} \mathbf{1} \mathbf{Q} \widehat{\mathbf{Z}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i}{(\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}} \right) \right], R^u(t) \right) / R^u(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\mathcal{E}}$ ,  $\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i$  are estimated by Principal Orthogonal complEment Thresholding (POET) (Fan et al., 2013), and  $R^u(t) = \#\{P_i^u : P_i^u \leq t\}$ . In particular, the number of latent common factor is selected by the information criterion as defined in Bai and Ng (2002). For a pre-chosen  $\alpha$ , the data-driven threshold is determined by

$$t_{\alpha}(\widehat{\text{FDP}}^u) = \sup\{0 \leq t \leq 1; \widehat{\text{FDP}}^u(t) \leq \alpha\}.$$

PCA-PFA: a surrogate method similar to POET-PFA except that the unknown inci-

dence parameters are estimated by the method of principle component (Wang, 2012). Particularly, the number of latent factor is chosen using the method of eigenvalue ratio test in Ahn and Horenstein (2013).

#### 4.2. Impact of the number of latent factors on the estimated FDP




Figure 1: (a): Boxplot of the estimated FDP of the POET-PFA procedure [i.e.,  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}^u(t)$ ] for various choices of  $r$ ; (b): Boxplot of the estimated FDP of the proposed FAT procedure [i.e.,  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$ ] for various choices of  $r$ . Here,  $t = 0.01$ .

We first confirm that the *estimation approach* of the FAT procedure [i.e.,  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$ ] as well as  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}^u(t)$  in POET-PCA, do not possess the robustness properties in terms of underestimating or overestimating the number of latent factors. For this purpose, these two types of estimators are computed when the number of  $r$  is ranging from 0 to 5, while we fix the true number of latent factor as 1. To make a comparison, the Oracle FDPs with respect to the unadjusted and adjusted  $p$ -values serve as benchmarks. We found that  $\widehat{\text{FDP}}^u(t)$  when  $r = 1$  differs from the Oracle one, with lower median and narrower interquartile range (IQR), whereas the median of our estimator  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$  is almost identical to that of the Oracle case. This phenomenon is reasonable since we subtract the dependent variations shared across the tests from unadjusted test statistics, resulting in a more stable estimator of FDP. If we underestimate  $r$  as 0, these two types of estimators become the unadjusted version, thus they are identical with higher FDR. On the other hand, overestimating the number of latent factors can cause a catastrophic problem in the sense that both types of estimators of FDP are




Figure 2: (a): Boxplot of the estimated number of latent factors for various choices of  $r$  by the information criterion (Bai and Ng, 2002); (b): Boxplot of the estimated number of latent factors for various choices of  $r$  by the method of eigenvalue ratio test (Ahn and Horenstein, 2013); (c)-(f): Boxplots of the estimated number of latent factors by Fan et al. (2012) for various choices of threshold  $h$  and  $r$ . Here,  $h$  is the threshold value and  $r$  is the number of latent factors.

equal to 1. Hence, it will be interesting to document how the FAT procedure performs in terms of identifying the latent factors for a broader range of the number of the factors ( $r$ ). Towards this end, we vary the true number  $r$  from 1 to 10, and adapt the information criterion in Bai and Ng (2002) and the method of eigenvalue ratio test (Ahn and Horenstein, 2013) to select it, respectively. The results are shown in the upper panels of Figure 2, from which we can observe that both criteria are able to choose the true number of latent factors among various choices of  $r$  in every round of replication. It is worth mentioning that Fan et al. (2012) also designed a simple

method to choose the number of latent factors. However, the selection of the number of latent factors is sensitively affected by the choice of threshold  $h$  and the true number of latent factors  $r$ ; see panels (c)-(f) in Figure 2 for details. As a result, the number of latent factors will be selected by the information criterion in POET-PFA and by the method of eigenvalues ratio test in FAT procedure hereafter.

#### 4.3. FDP comparison




Figure 3: Scatter plots of the estimated FDP and true FDP as a function of  $\mu$ , for the FAT, unadjusted, POET-PFA and PCA-PFA procedures, respectively. Here,  $t = 0.01$ ,  $\pi_0 = 0.95$ ,  $N = 1,000$  and  $T = 100$ .

To evaluate the overall performance of  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$  for the FAT procedure under sparsity, we consider a scenario with  $N = 1000$ ,  $T = 100$  and  $\pi_0 = 0.95$ . Figure 3 depicts the scatter plots of the estimated  $\text{FDP}(t)$  versus the true one for the FAT procedure and the competing procedures when  $t = 0.01$  and  $\mu = 0.4, 0.8, 1.2$ , respectively. The results can be summarized as follows. From panels (a)-(c), the estimated  $\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda(t)$  for the FAT procedure is very close to  $\text{FDP}(t)$  with small variability, which is consistent with the theoretical finding of Theorem 1 that our *estimation approach* (2.12) is valid. As a comparison, the unadjusted procedure [Panels (d)-(f)] exhibits a negative-correlated pattern between the estimated and true ones. Interestingly, the performance of POET-PFA and PCA-PFA are identical, implying that our computationally efficient PCA algorithm can achieve the same desired results as the complex POET method did. In general, both PFA methods can track the correct pattern of FDP but are highly unstable when the noise ( $\mathcal{E}_t$ ) is strongly dependent, in the sense that it can be liberal [panel (g)], consistent [panel (h)] or conservative [panel (i)].

#### 4.4. FDR control and power comparison

To further validate the strong control of our FAT procedure using the data-driven threshold  $t_\alpha(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)$ , Figure 4 examines the control of FDR as well as power of the FAT, unadjusted, POET-PFA and PCA-PFA procedures for different combinations of  $(T, \mu)$  when  $N = 1,000$ ,  $\pi_0 = 0.95$ . The left panels of Figure 4 depict the empirical FDP [i.e.,  $\text{FDP}(\widehat{t}_\alpha)$ ] of all settings, while the right panels are corresponding to the empirical power [i.e.,  $S(\widehat{t}_\alpha)/N_1$ ]. Clearly, the empirical FDPs of our FAT procedure are all controlled at the nominal level  $\alpha = 0.01$ , whereas the empirical FDP of unadjusted procedure is out of control for each scenario. Inherited from the unstable performance of the PFA methods as shown in Figure 3, the POET-PFA and PCA-PFA procedures lack the ability to provide persistent strong control of FDR. Furthermore, the FAT procedure continues to be more powerful than the competing procedures even when these procedures lose their control for FDR. The results are expected since subtracting common factors leads to higher signal-to-noise ratio.




Figure 4: Empirical FDP and power as a function of  $\mu$  and  $T$ , for the FAT, unadjusted, POET-PFA and PCA-PFA procedures, respectively. Here,  $\alpha = 0.01$ ,  $N = 1,000$  and  $\pi_0 = 0.95$ . The results are based on 500 replications.

#### 4.5. Model Selection Consistency

Table 1: The performance of  $t_{\alpha_T}(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)$  under sparsity.

| $T$ | $\alpha_T$ | FDP     | $t_{\alpha_T}(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)$ | Power   |
|-----|------------|---------|----------------------------------------------|---------|
| 32  | 0.18024    | 0.17627 | 0.00775                                      | 1.00000 |
| 36  | 0.08572    | 0.07642 | 0.00297                                      | 1.00000 |
| 40  | 0.05377    | 0.03844 | 0.00078                                      | 1.00000 |
| 44  | 0.03248    | 0.02496 | 0.00022                                      | 1.00000 |
| 48  | 0.01435    | 0.00608 | 0.00008                                      | 1.00000 |
| 52  | 0.00646    | 0.00381 | 0.00003                                      | 1.00000 |
| 56  | 0.00594    | 0.00333 | 0.00003                                      | 1.00000 |
| 60  | 0.00289    | 0.00033 | 0.00001                                      | 1.00000 |

Under sparsity, it is numerically interesting to show that there exists a sequence of  $\alpha_T \rightarrow 0$  such that the data-driven thresholds  $t_{\alpha_T}(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda) \rightarrow 0$  can distinguish the true

null and non-null consistently in the sense that the power is approaching one, while the empirical FDP is shrinking to zero. To this end, we consider a extremely sparse design with  $N = 1,000$ ,  $\pi_0 = 0.995$  and  $\mu = 1$ . For each  $T$ ,  $\alpha_T$  is selected by

$$\alpha_T = \inf \{0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, S\{t_\alpha(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)\}/N_1 = 1\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Table 1 summaries the average values of  $\alpha_T$ ,  $t_{\alpha_T}(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)$ , as well as the empirical FDP and power for a sequence of  $T$  values. As expected, both  $\alpha_T$  and  $t_{\alpha_T}(\widehat{\text{FDR}}_\lambda)$  are shrinking to zero as  $T$  increases, while the empirical power is always one, from which Theorem 2 is verified. Moreover, the empirical FDP is consistently smaller but close to  $\alpha_T$ , supporting that the FAT procedure can achieve model selection consistency under sparse setting.

## 5. REAL DATA ANALYSIS

### 5.1. Background and Data Description

To further illustrate the utility of the proposed FAT procedure, we consider a real data analysis here intended to pick skilled funds in USA financial markets. The data is from the Bloomberg database, which is one of the most popularly used and authoritative databases in the world. After eliminating the funds with missing values, we finally collect a total of  $T = 215$  observations on  $N = 767$  mutual funds in USA financial market during periods 1995/11 to 2013/08, with each observation corresponding to one particular fund's monthly excess return ( $Y_{it}$ ), which is defined as fund return ( $r_{mt}$ ) minors the risk free interest rate ( $r_{ft}$ ). Here,  $r_{ft}$  is proxied by the monthly 30-day T-bill of beginning of month yield. In this dataset,  $N = 767$  is much larger than  $T = 215$ , which is in accordance with our theoretical findings and simulation studies. According to the definition of Barras et al. (2010), a fund can be regarded as a skilled fund if its risk adjusted return which is defined as  $\mu_i$  in model (2.4) is larger than 0. In contrast, a fund is a un-skilled fund if  $\mu_i < 0$ , while the funds with  $\mu_i = 0$  are called

zero-alpha funds, that is, their funds returns are mainly due to noise. According to the above definition, the main focus is to identify these funds with  $\mu_i > 0$  in model (2.4) involving some observed and unobserved systematic risks. To this end, our FAT procedure can be used.

### 5.2. Trading Strategy

We use CAPM (Sharpe, 1964; Lintner, 1965) as the benchmark pricing model, that is, the observable systematic risk is single market risk  $r_{mt} - r_{ft}$ , which is proxied by month  $t$  excess return on CRSP NYSE/Amex/NASDAQ value weighted return (Barras et al., 2010). To assess the usefulness of the proposed FAT procedure, we consider the following rolling window method. Specifically, for some given length of estimation window  $L$ , for each observation  $\tau \in \{1, \dots, T-L\}$ , we conduct the proposed FAT procedure using data from periods  $\tau$  to  $\tau + L - 1$  with pre-specified FDR level  $\gamma$ . At any time  $\tau$ , let  $d_\tau$  be the estimated latent common factors number,  $\mathcal{S}_\tau^+$  be the collection of selected funds with  $\mu_i > 0$ , while  $\mathcal{S}_\tau^-$  be the collection of selected funds with  $\mu_i < 0$ . Let  $|\mathcal{S}_\tau^+|$  and  $|\mathcal{S}_\tau^-|$  be the number of elements in  $\mathcal{S}_\tau^+$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\tau^-$  respectively. Based on this setting, at time  $\tau + L$ , if we buy the funds  $\mathcal{S}_{\tau+L}^+$  with equal weight  $1/|\mathcal{S}_{\tau+L}^+|$ , while sell the funds  $\mathcal{S}_{\tau+L}^-$  with weight  $1/|\mathcal{S}_{\tau+L}^-|$  on each fund, then the return for this strategy at time  $\tau + L$  is given by  $r_\tau^{adj} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_\tau^+} Y_{\tau+L,j}/|\mathcal{S}_{\tau+L}^+| + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_\tau^-} Y_{\tau+L,j}/|\mathcal{S}_{\tau+L}^-|$ . As a comparison, we also report the results without controlling for any latent common factors (Barras et al., 2010). Accordingly, we refer to the return for un-adjusted multiple testing procedure as  $r_\tau$  at time  $\tau + L$ .

### 5.3. Performance Comparison

We set  $L = 120$  and  $\gamma = 0.20$  in this analysis, while the results for other selections of  $L$  and  $\gamma$  are relatively similar. To compare the results based on the above two trading strategies (i.e., the FAT and un-adjusted procedures), we report

the following performance measures. For any  $\tau \in \{1, \dots, T - L\}$ , we compute average latent common factors  $\sum_{\tau} d_{\tau} / (T - L)$ , the average proportion of selected skilled funds  $(T - L)^{-1} \sum_{\tau} |\mathcal{S}_{\tau}^+| / N$ , and the average proportion of selected un-skilled funds  $(T - L)^{-1} \sum_{\tau} |\mathcal{S}_{\tau}^-| / N$ . To compare the return persistency of these two trading strategies, we collect the return difference as  $r_{\tau}^{diff} = r_{\tau}^{adj} - r_{\tau}$ , and then evaluate the mean of  $r_{\tau}^{diff}$  together with its  $p$ -value. The finding can be summarized as follows. The average number of latent common factors is 1.66, which implies that other than market risk, there are indeed some other risk factors that affect fund return. Nevertheless, the number of latent common factors should vary with time. The average proportions of selected skilled funds for the two methods are 1% and 0%, while the average proportions of selected un-skilled funds for the two methods are 7.6% and 2.3%, respectively. In summary, our FAT procedure has higher power that can identify 1% skilled funds, whereas the un-adjusted procedure fails to identify any skilled funds in finite samples. This is consistent with our simulation studies and Berk and Green equilibrium (Berk and Green, 2004). Furthermore, the mean of  $r_{\tau}^{diff}$  is 0.425% with its  $p$ -value 0.019, which is significantly below 5%. This further implies that the trading strategy based on FAT procedure is more likely to select the funds that can earn persistent return in the future, and more likely to select the skilled funds in finite samples.

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARK

In this article, we propose a factor-adjusted multiple testing procedure for deciding whether the intercept of each unit equals zero in a linear factor model involving some observable and unobservable common factors, while the idiosyncratic errors were allowed to be correlated across units. Based on the method of principal component (Wang, 2012) for extracting the unknown latent common factors, we show theoretically that under some mild conditions, the proposed method can estimate the false discovery proportion (FDP) consistently for any given threshold. Finally, we show that the FAT procedure enjoys model selection consistency.

To broaden the usefulness of the proposed method, we conclude the article by identifying two possible research avenues. Since we only considered testing for the intercepts in linear factor model, it should be practically useful and theoretically demanding to adapt the proposed method to test the significance of certain regression coefficients. Another avenue is to extend the proposed method to nonlinear factor models, so that the response variables are allowed to be discrete.

## APPENDIX

### *Appendix A. Some Useful Lemmas*

To facilitate the theoretical derivations proposed in this article, we present some useful lemmas first. The first lemma is the strong law of large numbers for weakly dependent data, which can be found in Lyons (1988), while the second lemma can be obtained directly through Bonferroni inequality (Wang, 2012), and the third lemma is directly borrowed from Fan and Han (2013). As a result, we only present the proof of the last three lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of real-valued random variables such that  $E|x_i|^2 \leq 1$  a.s. and  $\sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k} E[\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \leq k} x_i]^2 < \infty$ , then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \leq k} x_i = 0$  a.s..*

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\chi_{i,T}$  be independent random variable with chi-square distribution of degree  $T$ , then we should have  $\max_i |T^{-1} \chi_{i,T} - 1| = O_p(\sqrt{\log N/T})$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .*

**Lemma 3.** *For any arbitrary matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , we have*

$$|\lambda_{i\mathbf{A}} - \lambda_{i\mathbf{B}}| \leq \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\zeta_{i\mathbf{A}} - \zeta_{i\mathbf{B}}\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\|}{\min\{|\lambda_{i-1,\mathbf{A}} - \lambda_{i\mathbf{B}}|, |\lambda_{i+1,\mathbf{A}} - \lambda_{i\mathbf{B}}|\}},$$

where  $\lambda_{i\mathbf{C}}$ 's and  $\zeta_{i\mathbf{C}}$ 's are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of any arbitrary matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose the conditions in Proposition 2 hold. Then, we can obtain that*

$$N_0^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\gamma}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\gamma}_i\| = O_p(N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2) + O_p(N_1^{1/2}N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|) = o_p(1).$$

**Proof.** Note that  $\hat{\gamma}^\top = (\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathcal{E}}^\top$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}^\top = (\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{E}^\top$ . Then, for any  $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$ , we can have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\gamma}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\gamma}_i\|^2 &= \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top (\mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i + \mu_i \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}) - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i\|^2 \\ &= \|\{\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\} \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i\|^2 = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\top \mathcal{Q} \{\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\}^2 \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \\ &\leq \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\|^2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = (\varepsilon_{i1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{iT})^\top$ . We firstly consider  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ . By  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  with  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = (\eta_{i1}, \dots, \eta_{iT})^\top$ , we have  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = \boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\eta}_i + 2\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^\top \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i$ . Further note that  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  follows a multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix  $\sigma_{ii}^\eta \mathbf{I}_T$ . Thus,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\eta}_i / \sigma_{ii}^\eta$  follows a chi-square distribution with degrees of freedom  $T - p$ . By Lemma 2, we have  $\max_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = O_p(T)$ . In addition, by condition (C4) and the identification condition  $\text{cov}(\mathbf{Z}_t) = \mathbf{I}_r$ , we can obtain  $\max_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^\top \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i \leq T \max_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_i \leq T \gamma_{\max}$  with probability tending to one. Combining these results, we have  $\max_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i^\top \mathcal{Q}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i = O_p(T)$ . We next consider the first part of (A.1). By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}(\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Z}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\|^2 &= \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\|^2 / T^2 \\ &= \|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top + \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\|^2 / T^2 \\ &\leq 2\|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\|^2 / T^2 + 2\|\hat{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}^\top\|^2 / T^2 = 4\|\hat{\mathbf{Z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\|^2 / T. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Lemma 3, we can obtain

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{Z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}\|^2 \leq 2r \|N^{-1} \hat{\mathcal{E}}^\top \hat{\mathcal{E}} - N^{-1} \mathcal{Q} \mathcal{E}^\top \mathcal{E} \mathcal{Q}\|^2 / K_{\min}^2,$$

where  $K_{\min} = \min \{|\hat{\lambda}_{i-1} - \tilde{\lambda}_i|, |\hat{\lambda}_{i+1} - \tilde{\lambda}_i|\}$ . By Lemma 3 again, and using Cauchy-

Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|N^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\top\widehat{\mathcal{E}} - N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\| &= \|N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q} + 2N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}\|N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q}\| + \sqrt{2}\|2N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\|.\end{aligned}$$

We next consider the above two parts separately. We firstly consider the first part.

$$\|N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q}\|^2 \leq \|N^{-1}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\|^2 = N^{-2}\text{tr}\left\{\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\right\} = N^{-2}T^2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^4.$$

Moreover, one can easily verify that  $\lambda_{\max}(N^{-1}T^{-1}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}^\top) = O_p(1)$  by condition (C4) and the identification condition  $\text{cov}(\mathbf{Z}_t) = \mathbf{I}_r$ . Consequently, we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\|N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\|^2 &= N^{-2}\text{tr}\left\{\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q}\right\} = N^{-2}\text{tr}\left\{\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\right\} \\ &= N^{-2}(\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1})(\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}) \leq N^{-2}T\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}^\top)\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2 = O\left(N^{-2}N_1T^2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

By condition (C2), we can obtain that

$$\|N^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\top\widehat{\mathcal{E}} - N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\| = O_p\left(N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2\right) + O_p\left(N_1^{1/2}N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|\right) = o_p(1).$$

We next consider  $K_{\min}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned}|\widehat{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_i| &= |\widehat{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_{i-1} + \widetilde{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_i| \\ &\geq |\widetilde{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_i| - |\widehat{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_{i-1}|.\end{aligned}$$

By the theorem assumption, we have  $|\widetilde{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_i| \geq d_N$  for any  $i = 2, \dots, r$ . Moreover, by Lemma 3 again, we have

$$|\widehat{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_{i-1}| \leq \|N^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\top\widehat{\mathcal{E}} - N^{-1}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top\mathcal{E}\mathcal{Q}\| = o_p(1).$$

Consequently, with probability approaching 1,

$$2K_{\min} \geq |\widehat{\lambda}_{i-1} - \widetilde{\lambda}_i| \geq d_N.$$

Combining the above results, we can obtain that

$$N_0^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i\| = O_p\left(N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2\right) + O_p\left(N_1^{1/2}N^{-1}T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|\right) = o_p(1).$$

**Lemma 5.** *Under conditions (C1)–(C4) and the assumption that  $\eta_{it}$  is normally distributed, we can obtain that*

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} |\widetilde{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta - \sigma_{ii}^\eta| = O_p\{N\sqrt{\log N/T}\}.$$

**Proof.** Details can be found in supplemental material.

**Lemma 6.** *Under conditions (C1)–(C5) and the assumption that  $\eta_{it}$  is normally distributed, we can obtain that*

$$N_0^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_i - \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i\| = O_p\{(\log N)^{1/4}/T^{1/2}\} + O_p(N^{-\nu}).$$

**Proof.** Details can be found in supplemental material.

### Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 2 (i)

Hereafter, for notation convenience, we use notations  $C_1, C_2, \dots$  to denote some generic positive constants. We firstly prove (3.3), define  $\Lambda = (TN)^{-1}\widehat{\mathcal{E}}\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\top$ . Then, employing the similar techniques as that of Ahn and Horenstein (2013), one can verify that  $\widehat{\lambda}_j = O_p(1)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ , and  $\widehat{\lambda}_j = O_p(T^{-1})$  for  $j = r+2, \dots, \pi_{\max}$ . Moreover,  $\widehat{\lambda}_j/\widehat{\lambda}_{j+1} = O_p(1)$  for  $j = r+2, \dots, \pi_{\max}$  and  $j = 1, \dots, r-1$ . Based on this, we only need to consider the order of  $\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1}$ , which is dependent on  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ . By

definition that  $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}^\top = \mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top + \mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}^\top$ , and by the similar arguments as Lemma 12 of Ahn and Horenstein (2013), we have  $\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1} = (TN)^{-1}\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{Q}\mathbf{1}\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{1}^\top\mathcal{Q}) + O_p(T^{-1}) = O_p(\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2/N) + O_p(T^{-1})$ . As a result, if  $O_p(\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2/N) = O_p(T^{-1})$ . Then, we have  $\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1} = O_p(T^{-1})$ , which leads to  $\widehat{\lambda}_r/\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1} = O_p(T)$  and  $\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1}/\widehat{\lambda}_{r+2} = O_p(1)$ . Consequently, the eigenvalue ratio  $\widehat{\lambda}_j/\widehat{\lambda}_{j+1}$  can reach its maximum at  $j = r$ . Moreover, if  $O_p(T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2/N) \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, we have  $\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1} = O_p(\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2/N)$ , which leads to  $\widehat{\lambda}_r/\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1} = O_p(N/\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2)$  and  $\widehat{\lambda}_{r+1}/\widehat{\lambda}_{r+2} = O_p(T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2/N)$ . By condition (C2), we have  $T\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2/N = o(N/\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2)$ . Consequently, the eigenvalue ratio  $\widehat{\lambda}_j/\widehat{\lambda}_{j+1}$  can reach its maximum at  $j = r$ . Combining the results above, which completes the proof of Proposition 2 (i).

### Appendix C. Proof of Theorem 2

To complete the proof of the theorem, we only need to prove that there exist a sequence of threshold values  $t_T \rightarrow 0$  such that

$$\lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} V(t_T) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} S(t_T)/N_1 = 1. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We prove (A.2) in the following two steps accordingly.

STEP I. By the definition of  $V(t)$ , we can have

$$V(t_T) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} I(P_i \leq t_T) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} I(|\widehat{T}_i| > z_{1-t_T/2}).$$

Thus, by the Bonferroni inequality, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{V(t_T) > 0\right\} &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} |\widehat{T}_i| > z_{1-t_T/2}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \left|\widehat{T}_i - \{\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta\}^{1/2} \widetilde{T}_i\right| > \frac{z_{1-t_T/2}}{2}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \left|\{\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta\}^{1/2} \widetilde{T}_i\right| > \frac{z_{1-t_T/2}}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

We next consider the above two parts separately. To this end, we define  $t_T = 2\{1 - \Phi(2T^j)\}$  for some  $\hbar/2 < j < 1/2 - \kappa$ . Then we have  $\frac{z_{1-t_T/2}}{2} = T^j$ . We firstly con-

sider the second term of (A.3). Note that for every  $i \in \mathcal{N}_0$ ,  $\tilde{T}_i$  follows a standard normal distribution. As a result, by Bonferroni inequality, one can easily verify that  $\max_i |\tilde{T}_i| = O_p(\sqrt{\log N})$ . Moreover, similar to the proof of Lemma 5, we can obtain that  $\max_i |\{\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta\}^{1/2} - 1| = o_p(1)$ . Also, according to condition (C1),  $\log N = O(T^h)$ . Consequently, we can immediately have

$$P\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} |\{\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta\}^{1/2} \tilde{T}_i| > \frac{z_{1-t_T/2}}{2}\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

We next consider the first term of (A.3). Note that

$$(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \left( \hat{T}_i - \{\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta\}^{1/2} \tilde{T}_i \right) = (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i) / (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2}.$$

Similar to the proof of Lemma 5, we can obtain that  $\max_i |\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta - \sigma_{ii}^\eta| = O_p\{\sqrt{\log N/T}\}$ . Consequently, there exists some positive constant  $C_4$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i) / (\hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} &= \{1 + o_p(1)\} (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \boldsymbol{\eta}_i - \mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i) / (\sigma_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} \\ &\leq C_4 |\mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\eta}_i)| \leq C_4 (\mathbf{1}^\top \mathcal{Q} \mathbf{1})^{1/2} \max_i \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\eta}_i\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the similar arguments of the proof of Lemma 5, one can easily verify that  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_i - \boldsymbol{\eta}_i\| = O_p(\sqrt{\log N})$ . Combining these results above, we have  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} |\hat{T}_i - (\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta)^{1/2} \tilde{T}_i| = O_p(\sqrt{\log N})$ . Consequently, by the theorem assumption and the definition of  $j$ ,

$$P\left(\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_0} \left| \hat{T}_i - \{\sigma_{ii}^\eta / \hat{\sigma}_{ii}^\eta\}^{1/2} \tilde{T}_i \right| > z_{1-t_T/2}\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

Combining these results above, we have completed the first part of (A.2).

STEP II. We next show the second part of (A.2). By definition, we have

$$S(t_T)/N_1 = N_1^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} I\left\{\left|\hat{T}_i\right| > 2T^j\right\}.$$

Similar to the proof of the first part of (A.2), we have

$$P\left\{\max_i \left|\widehat{T}_i - \{\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}/\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\}^{1/2}\widetilde{T}_i\right| > 2T^j\right\} \rightarrow 0.$$

As a result, we have  $\max_i \left|\widehat{T}_i - \{\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}/\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\}^{1/2}\widetilde{T}_i\right| = o(T^j)$ . We next consider  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |\widetilde{T}_i|$ . By the theorem condition, we can obtain  $\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1})^{1/2}\mu_i/(\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}| \geq O(T^{1/2-\kappa})$ . Moreover, since  $(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1})^{-1/2}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i\cdot}/(\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}$  follows a standard normal distribution. Consequently, by the Bonferroni inequality, we have  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1})^{-1/2}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i\cdot}/(\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}| = O_p(\sqrt{\log N_1})$ . Therefore, by condition (C1), we then obtain that

$$\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |\widetilde{T}_i| \geq \min_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1})^{1/2}\mu_i/(\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}| - \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} |(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{1})^{-1/2}\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i\cdot}/(\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}| = O(T^{1/2-\kappa}).$$

In addition, note that  $\kappa + j < 1/2$  by the choice of  $j$ . Then,  $|\widehat{T}_i| \geq |(\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}/\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}\widetilde{T}_i| - |\widehat{T}_i - (\sigma_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}/\widehat{\sigma}_{ii}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}})^{1/2}\widetilde{T}_i| = O(T^{1/2-\kappa})$ , which leads to

$$N_1^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_1} I\left\{\left|\widehat{T}_i\right| > z_{1-t_T/2}\right\} \rightarrow 1,$$

which completes the entire proof.

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Detailed proofs of Lemma 5, Lemma 6, Proposition 1, Proposition 2 (ii) and Theorem 1 can be found in a supplemental file.

## REFERENCES

- Ahn, S. C. and Horenstein, A. (2013). “Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors,” *Econometrica*, 81, 1203–1227.
- Allen, G. I. and Tibshirani, R. (2012). “Inference with transposable data: modelling the effects of row and column correlations,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74, 721–743.

- Bai, J. (2003). “Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions,” *Econometrica*, 71, 135–171.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). “Determining the number of common factors in approximate factor model,” *Econometrica*, 70, 191–221.
- Barras, L., Scaillet, O. and Wermers, R. (2010). “False discoveries in mutual fund performance: measuring luck in estimated alphas,” *Journal of Finance*, 65, 179–216.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). “Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 57, 289–300.
- Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). “The control of false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency,” *Annals of Statistics*, 29, 1165–1188.
- Berk, J. B. and Green, R. C. (2004). “Mutual fund flows and performance in rational markets,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 112, 1269–1295.
- Carhart, M. (1997). “On persistence in mutual fund performance,” *Journal of Finance*, 52, 57–82.
- Chamberlain, G, and Rothschild, M. (1983), “Arbitrage, factor structure, and mean variance analysis on large asset markets,” *Econometrica*, 51, 1281–1304.
- Clarke, S. and Hall, P. (2009). “Robustness of multiple testing procedures against dependence,” *Annals of Statistics*, 37, 332–358.
- Cornell, B. (2009). “Luck, skill, and investment performance,” *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 35, 131–134.
- Cuthbertson, K., Nitzsche, D. and O’Sullivan, N. (2008). “UK mutual fund performance: skill or luck?,” *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 15, 613–634.

- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R. (1993). “Common risk factors in the return on stocks and bonds,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33, 3–56.
- Fama, E. F. and French, K. R. (2010). “Luck versus skill in the cross section of mutual fund returns,” *Journal of Finance*, 65, 1915–1947.
- Fan, J., Fan, Y., and Lv, J. (2008). “High dimensional covariance matrix estimation using a factor model,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 147, 186–197.
- Fan, J. and Han, X. (2013). “Estimation of false discovery proportion with unknown dependence,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1305.7007*.
- Fan, J., Han, X. and Gu, W. (2012). “Estimating false discovery proportion under arbitrary covariance dependence,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107, 1019–1035.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y. and Mincheva, M. (2011). “High dimensional covariance matrix estimation in approximate factor models,” *Annals of Statistics*, 39, 3320–3356.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y. and Mincheva, M. (2013). “Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 75, 603–680.
- Friguet, C., Kloeareg, M. and Causeur, D. (2009). “A factor model approach to multiple testing under dependence,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 1406–1415.
- Genovese, C. R., Roeder, K. and Wasserman, L. (2006). “False discovery control with p-value weighting,” *Biometrika*, 93, 509–524.
- Grinblatt, M. and Titman, S. (1992). “The persistence of mutual fund performance,” *Journal of Finance*, 47, 1977–1984.
- Jin, S., Su, L. and Zhang, Y. (2014). “Nonparametric testing for anomaly effects in empirical asset pricing models,” *Empirical Economics*, Forthcoming.

- Kleibergen, K. and Zhan, Z. (2013). “Unexplained factors and their effects on second pass R-square’s and t-tests,” *Working Paper*.
- Leek, J. T. and Storey, J. D. (2008). “A general framework for multiple testing dependence,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of United States of America*, 105, 18718–18723.
- Lintner, J. (1965). “The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investment in stock portfolios and capital budges,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 47, 13–37.
- Lyons, R. (1988). “Strong laws of large numbers for weakly correlated random variables,” *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 35, 353–359.
- Pesaran, M. H. (2006). “Estimation and inference in large heterogeneous panels with a multi-factor error structure,” *Econometrica*, 74, 967–1012.
- Sharpe, W. F. (1964). “Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk,” *Journal of Finance*, 19, 425–442.
- Storey, J. D., Taylor, J. E. and Siegmund, D. (2004). “Strong control, conservative point estimation and simultaneous conservative consistency of false discovery rates: a unified approach,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 66, 187–205.
- Sun, W. and Cai, T. (2009). “Large-scale multiple testing under dependence,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 71, 393–424.
- Wang, H. (2009). “Forward regression for ultra-high dimensional variable screening,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 1512–1524.
- Wang, H. (2012). “Factor profiled independence screening,” *Biometrika*, 99, 15–28.
- Wang, H. and Leng, C. (2007). “Unified LASSO estimation by least squares approximation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 1039–1048.

Wasserman, L. and Roeder, K. (2009). “High dimensional variable selection,” *Annals of statistics*, 37, 2178–2201.